

2007 DRAFTING REQUEST

Senate Amendment (SA-SSA1-SB40)

Received: **06/15/2007**

Received By: **rkite**

Wanted: **As time permits**

Identical to LRB:

For: **Legislative Fiscal Bureau**

By/Representing: **Rushmer**

This file may be shown to any legislator: **NO**

Drafter: **rkite**

May Contact:

Addl. Drafters:

Subject: **Nat. Res. - nav. waters**

Extra Copies:

Submit via email: **YES**

Requester's email:

Carbon copy (CC:) to:

Pre Topic:

LFB:.....Rushmer -

Topic:

Earmark for funding Superior Harbor Corrosion study

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/?							
/1	rkite 06/18/2007	kfollett 06/18/2007	pgreensl 06/18/2007	_____	lparisi 06/18/2007		
/2	rkite 06/19/2007	kfollett 06/19/2007	nmatzke 06/19/2007	_____	sbasford 06/19/2007		
/3	rkite 06/19/2007	kfollett 06/19/2007	jfrantze 06/19/2007	_____	lparisi 06/19/2007		

FE Sent For:

<END>

2007 DRAFTING REQUEST

Senate Amendment (SA-SSA1-SB40)

Received: **06/15/2007**

Received By: **rkite**

Wanted: **As time permits**

Identical to LRB:

For: **Legislative Fiscal Bureau**

By/Representing: **Rushmer**

This file may be shown to any legislator: **NO**

Drafter: **rkite**

May Contact:

Addl. Drafters:

Subject: **Nat. Res. - nav. waters**

Extra Copies:

Submit via email: **YES**

Requester's email:

Carbon copy (CC:) to:

Pre Topic:

LFB:.....Rushmer -

Topic:

Earmark for funding Superior Harbor Corrosion study

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/?							
/1	rkite 06/18/2007	kfollett 06/18/2007	pgreensl 06/18/2007	_____	lparisi 06/18/2007		
/2	rkite 06/19/2007	kfollett 06/19/2007	nnatzke 06/19/2007	_____	sbasford 06/19/2007		

FE Sent For:

<END>

2007 DRAFTING REQUEST**Senate Amendment (SA-SSA1-SB40)**Received: **06/15/2007**Received By: **rkite**Wanted: **As time permits**

Identical to LRB:

For: **Legislative Fiscal Bureau**By/Representing: **Rushmer**This file may be shown to any legislator: **NO**Drafter: **rkite**

May Contact:

Addl. Drafters:

Subject: **Nat. Res. - nav. waters**

Extra Copies:

Submit via email: **YES**

Requester's email:

Carbon copy (CC:) to:

Pre Topic:

LFB:.....Rushmer -

Topic:

Earmark for funding Superior Harbor Corrosion study

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/?							
/1	rkite 06/18/2007	kfollett 06/18/2007	pgreensl 06/18/2007		lparisi 06/18/2007		

FE Sent For:

<END>

2007 DRAFTING REQUEST

Senate Amendment (SA-SSA1-SB40)

Received: 06/15/2007

Received By: rkite

Wanted: As time permits

Identical to LRB:

For: Legislative Fiscal Bureau

By/Representing: Rushmer

This file may be shown to any legislator: NO

Drafter: rkite

May Contact:

Addl. Drafters:

Subject: Nat. Res. - nav. waters

Extra Copies:

Submit via email: YES

Requester's email:

Carbon copy (CC:) to:

Pre Topic:

LFB:.....Rushmer -

Topic:

Earmark for funding Superior Harbor Corrosion study

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
1/?	rkite	1/1/07 6/1/07					

FE Sent For:

<END>

Senate Democratic Caucus

2007-09 Budget Amendment Request

Title: Superior Harbor Dockwall Corrosion Study

Date: June 14

Senate Assigned #: 44

Legislator: Robson

Staff Contact: Summer Shannon-Bradley

Statement of Amendment Intent: Provide \$100,000 SEG from the Waterways Commission for the City of Superior to complete a Duluth/Superior Harbor Corrosion Study. *rec boating*

This amendment would provide the funding necessary to continue a study of the corrosion of the dockwall and will supplement \$100,000 from the state of Minnesota and \$300,000 from the Army Corps of Engineers.

from (SLCQ)

Agency: DNR

- match ?

*30.92
earmark*

*Dan Cannon Jareh
6-3510*

Fiscal Impact: \$100,000

Funding Source: SEG

no match

Attachments: None

Kite, Robin

From: Rushmer, Erin
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2007 10:12 AM
To: Kite, Robin
Subject: RE: dock wall corrosion study

Yeah. That sounds good to me. I think it's easier if we give DNR a specific year and then they know they have to set it aside right away.

From: Kite, Robin
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2007 10:09 AM
To: Rushmer, Erin
Subject: RE: dock wall corrosion study

So should I draft it so that DNR is required to provide the funding in fiscal year 2007-2008?

Robin Kite
266-7291

From: Rushmer, Erin
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2007 10:08 AM
To: Kite, Robin
Subject: RE: dock wall corrosion study

That's correct. It's a one-time earmark. In my summary I placed it in 2007-08. But no, it's not ongoing.

From: Kite, Robin
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2007 10:07 AM
To: Rushmer, Erin
Subject: RE: dock wall corrosion study

Erin-

I have another question. I had assumed that the funding for this project is intended only for the 2007-09 biennium. Is this correct? Or is the funding intended to apply over a longer period?

Robin Kite
266-7291

From: Rushmer, Erin
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2007 8:44 AM
To: Kite, Robin
Subject: RE: dock wall corrosion study

Ok sounds good. Thanks.
-Erin

From: Kite, Robin
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2007 8:44 AM
To: Rushmer, Erin
Subject: RE: dock wall corrosion study

I think that is all we need to know. I assumed that this wasn't a feasibility study but just wanted to be sure. I don't think we

will need to add the notwithstanding language.

Robin Kite
266-7291

From: Rushmer, Erin
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2007 8:43 AM
To: Kite, Robin
Subject: RE: dock wall corrosion study

Additional info- Apparently it's NOT a feasibility study. It's a study to determine what is causing the dockwall to corrode at such a quick rate. Does that clarify it? Or do you still think we need to do a notwithstanding?
-Erin

From: Kite, Robin
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2007 8:21 AM
To: Rushmer, Erin
Subject: RE: dock wall corrosion study

Thanks!

Robin Kite
266-7291

From: Rushmer, Erin
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2007 8:21 AM
To: Kite, Robin
Cc: Gibson-Glass, Mary
Subject: RE: dock wall corrosion study

Robin- For the dockwall, I'm not sure what type of study it is. I'll try and get something on it this morning, but it's still too early for some legislative offices.

As to your second question- yes, I think we should specify that this funding be provided before the percentages under s. 30.92(4)(b)6.

Thanks,
-Erin

From: Kite, Robin
Sent: Saturday, June 16, 2007 1:58 PM
To: Rushmer, Erin
Subject: dock wall corrosion study

Erin:

With regard to recreational boating aids projects, current law provides that not more than 10% of state funds available for recreational boating aids may be expended for feasibility studies in one year. I have 2 questions: Is the dock wall corrosion study a feasibility study? If so, do I need to notwithstanding this provision?

Also, should the funding be provided before applying the percentages under s. 30.92 (4) (b) 6.? Take a look at the language in s. 30.92 (4r) and (4t) to see how we have done this before.

Thanks.

Robin

Robin Kite, Senior Legislative Attorney
Wisconsin Legislative Reference Bureau
1 East Main Street, Suite 200
Madison, WI 53703
(608) 266-7291



State of Wisconsin
2007 - 2008 LEGISLATURE

LRBb0389/2

RNK: 10/1/08

LFB:.....Rushmer - Earmark for funding Superior Harbor Corrosion study

FOR 2007-09 BUDGET -- NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

**SENATE AMENDMENT ,
TO SENATE SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT 1,
TO 2007 SENATE BILL 40**

1 At the locations indicated, amend the substitute amendment as follows:

2 1. Page 1627, line 15: after that line insert: in fiscal year 2007-2008

3 4f (3m) DULUTH-SUPERIOR HARBOR STUDY. From the appropriation under section
4 20.370 (5) (cq) of the statutes, as affected by this act, the department of natural
5 resources shall provide \$100,000 to the city of Superior for a project to study dock
6 wall corrosion in the Duluth-Superior harbor. The city of Superior need not
7 contribute any moneys to match the amount expended from the appropriation under
8 section 20.370 (5) (cq) of the statutes. This project need not be placed on the priority

1 list under section 30.92 (3) (a) of the statutes. [✓] ~~This subsection does not apply after~~
2 ~~June 30, 2009.~~

3 (END)

Kite, Robin

From: Rushmer, Erin
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2007 11:21 AM
To: Kite, Robin
Cc: Gibson-Glass, Mary
Subject: RE: dock wall corrosion study

Robin/Mary- In the draft I just received (draft 0389/1) I think we need some language specify that the funding should be provided before the percentages are applied. I don't think the "this project need not be placed on the priority list under section 30.92(3)(a) of the statutes does it. Let me know if I'm just not understanding it. Thanks,
-Erin

From: Kite, Robin
Sent: Saturday, June 16, 2007 1:58 PM
To: Rushmer, Erin
Subject: dock wall corrosion study

Erin:

With regard to recreational boating aids projects, current law provides that not more than 10% of state funds available for recreational boating aids may be expended for feasibility studies in one year. I have 2 questions: Is the dock wall corrosion study a feasibility study? If so, do I need to notwithstand this provision?

Also, should the funding be provided before applying the percentages under s. 30.92 (4) (b) 6.? Take a look at the language in s. 30.92 (4r) and (4t) to see how we have done this before.

Thanks.

Robin

Robin Kite, Senior Legislative Attorney
Wisconsin Legislative Reference Bureau
1 East Main Street, Suite 200
Madison, WI 53703
(608) 266-7291



State of Wisconsin
2007 - 2008 LEGISLATURE

Rm run
2
LRBb0389/1
RNK:kjf:pg

LFB:.....Rushmer - Earmark for funding Superior Harbor Corrosion study
FOR 2007-09 BUDGET -- NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

SENATE AMENDMENT ,
TO SENATE SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT 1,
TO 2007 SENATE BILL 40

and the study of dock ^{wall} corrosion in the
Duluth-Superior Harbor is a qualifying project,

and (4)(b) 7. of
the statutes,

Notwithstanding section 30.92 (1)(c) [✓] as affected by
~~this act~~ the Duluth-Superior harbor is a recreational
facility for the purpose of expending moneys under this subsection.

At the locations indicated, amend the substitute amendment as follows:

1. Page 1627, line 15: after that line insert:

"(4f) DULUTH-SUPERIOR HARBOR STUDY. From the appropriation ^{of the amounts appropriated} under section
20.370 (5) (cq) of the statutes, as affected by this act, the department of natural
resources shall provide \$100,000 in fiscal year 2007-08 to the city of Superior for a
project to study dock wall corrosion in the Duluth-Superior harbor. The city of
Superior need not contribute any moneys to match the amount expended from the
appropriation under section 20.370 (5) (cq) of the statutes. This project need not be
placed on the priority list under section 30.92 (3) (a) of the statutes."

(END)

and before applying the percentages under
section 30.92 (4)(b) 6. of the statutes, as
affected by this act

Per Ena -

Don't refer to the corrosion of the dock wall
as a "recreational facility" - she thinks
that a study can't be a "facility" -
so just include that notwithstanding language
that qualifies the study for funding



State of Wisconsin
2007 - 2008 LEGISLATURE

RM run
LRBb0389/2³
RNK:kjf:nwn

LFB:.....Rushmer - Earmark for funding Superior Harbor Corrosion study
FOR 2007-09 BUDGET -- NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

**SENATE AMENDMENT ,
TO SENATE SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT 1,
TO 2007 SENATE BILL 40**

1 At the locations indicated, amend the substitute amendment as follows:

2 **1.** Page 1627, line 15: after that line insert:

3 “(4f) DULUTH-SUPERIOR HARBOR STUDY. Of the amounts appropriated under
4 section 20.370 (5) (cq) of the statutes, as affected by this act, and before applying the
5 percentages under section 30.92 (4) (b) 6. of the statutes, the department of natural
6 resources shall provide \$100,000 in fiscal year 2007-08 to the city of Superior for a
7 project to study dock wall corrosion in the Duluth-Superior Harbor. The city of
8 Superior need not contribute any moneys to match the amount expended from the
9 appropriation under section 20.370 (5) (cq) of the statutes. Notwithstanding section
10 30.92 (1) ~~(c)~~ and (4) (b) 7. of the statutes, the Duluth-Superior Harbor is a

1 (recreational facility, and the study of dock wall corrosion in the Duluth-Superior
2 Harbor is a qualifying project for the purpose of expending moneys under this
3 subsection. This project need not be placed on the priority list under section 30.92
4 (3) (a) of the statutes.”.

5 (END)



State of Wisconsin
2007 - 2008 LEGISLATURE

LRBb0389/3
RNK:kjf:jf

LFB:.....Rushmer - Earmark for funding Superior Harbor Corrosion study
FOR 2007-09 BUDGET -- NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

**SENATE AMENDMENT ,
TO SENATE SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT 1,
TO 2007 SENATE BILL 40**

1 At the locations indicated, amend the substitute amendment as follows:

2 **1.** Page 1627, line 15: after that line insert:

3 “(4f) DULUTH-SUPERIOR HARBOR STUDY. Of the amounts appropriated under
4 section 20.370 (5) (cq) of the statutes, as affected by this act, and before applying the
5 percentages under section 30.92 (4) (b) 6. of the statutes, the department of natural
6 resources shall provide \$100,000 in fiscal year 2007-08 to the city of Superior for a
7 project to study dock wall corrosion in the Duluth-Superior Harbor. The city of
8 Superior need not contribute any moneys to match the amount expended from the
9 appropriation under section 20.370 (5) (cq) of the statutes. Notwithstanding section
10 30.92 (1) (c) and (4) (b) 7. of the statutes, the study of dock wall corrosion in the

1 Duluth-Superior Harbor is a qualifying project for the purpose of expending moneys
2 under this subsection. This project need not be placed on the priority list under
3 section 30.92 (3) (a) of the statutes.”.

4 (END)